



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/719,364 | 11/21/2003 | Chris A. Peirson | 41722-P001US | 3590 |

7590 09/21/2009
Michael P. Adams
Winstead Sechrest & Minick P.C.
400 North Ervay Street
P.O. Box 50784
Dallas, TX 75201

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

TROTTER, SCOTT S

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

3694

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

09/21/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/719,364 | Applicant(s) PEIRSON ET AL. | |
| | Examiner SCOTT S. TROTTER | Art Unit 3694 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) SCOTT S. TROTTER. (3) Chris Peirson.

(2) Bill Peirson. (4) Bobby Voigt.

Date of Interview: 17 September 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 9.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hall (U.S. Patent 7,085,735).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: That what the application saw as their invention was more drawn to complicated audit features required to make the invention work in the real world. Since that detail did not appear in claim 9 any auditing functionality such as validating the address would be sufficient to meet the claim as written but adding more detail could change that assessment. It was also mentioned that the regulations could be used as prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

| | |
|--|--|
| | /James P Trammell/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3694 |
|--|--|